

**Minutes of the Carlisle Board of Health  
October 27, 2009**

Present: Board Members Chris Deignan (Chair Pro-tem), Jeff Brem, Bill Risso, Mark Caddell; Absent Michael Holland; also present: Linda Fantasia (Agent); Rob Frado (TCG)

The meeting was called to order by Deignan at 7:30 p.m. at the town hall.

**MINUTES** - tabled.

**BILLS** - Risso noted that the Loan Program is working well. Two systems are under construction. Additional funding (\$45,000) has been requested from the state to complete both installations. Bond counsel submitted and invoice for \$800 which will be paid out of the grant. CHD submitted an invoice for \$1093 which includes \$937 for review of Fern's expansion plans. This will be billed to Ferns.

It was moved (Caddell) and seconded (Deignan) to approve payment of the bills as presented. Motion passed 3.0.

**ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS**

H1N1 Clinic – vaccine delivery is delayed due to manufacturing problems. Communities can expect small, 100 dose supplies, over the next few weeks. The Board agreed to vaccinate only target populations until there is sufficient vaccine. Fantasia is coordinating with the MRC Ex. Committee.

Volunteer Appreciation – Certificates of Appreciation have been prepared for the volunteers who participated in the Ice Storm Shelter and for Lea Johnson for her work on the first Old Home Day Booth. Certificates will be presented later in the evening.

**PH 137 BINGHAM ROAD** – Plan entitled “Subsurface Sewage Disposal System, 137 Bingham Road, designed by Norse Design Services Inc., revised 10/1/09”; waiver requested: 310 CMR 15.405(1) (b) – Depth of Cover over System Components, 36” maximum required – 72” proposed. The hearing was opened. Present for the hearing was Jeff Hannaford of Norse Design Services and Bernard Lacomis, owner.

Hannaford explained that the proposed Presby system will replace an existing failed system. The system is designed for four bedrooms with a design flow capacity of 600 GPD in accordance with state and local regulations. The system is not designed for a garbage grinder. The site is greater than 100’ from the well and wetlands, except for the pump chamber and force main. The Conservation Commission has issued a conditional Order of Conditions for this work. The existing tank and pump chamber are deeper than 36”. The tanks will be inspected and reused if possible. New manhole covers will be installed to grade. The existing pump chamber has no access so this will be an improvement. The depth of the tanks is due to the location of the existing building sewer. Changing the location would cause considerably more disturbance to the site due to the slope of the grades and proximity to wetlands. Frado had reviewed and approved the final plan. (Brem arrived but recused himself from the hearing). The Board asked about a pumping schedule. Hannaford said the Presby system requires annual inspections. The tanks would be pumped if needed. Hannaford said the owners will need an extension to the winter shut down. The Board agreed to an additional 30 days, weather permitting. There were no further questions from the Board or comments from the public.

It was moved (Risso) and seconded (Caddell) to close the public hearing.

It was moved (Risso) and seconded (Caddell) to grant the following waivers for 137 Bingham Road: 310 CMR 15.405(1)(b) Depth of cover - 36” maximum, 72” proposed and a 30 day extension from the local winter shut down to allow completion of the work as approved by the Board’s consultant. Motion passed 3-0-1(Brem)

**BENFIELD FARMS** – present were Mark Beaudry (Meridian Engineering), Phil Giffey (NOAH), Alan Lehotsky (CHA), Wayne Kaufman, Alan Carpenito

Beaudry explained that Benfield Farms is a local comprehensive permit project consisting of 26 units in one building on town owner land along South Street. The entire parcel consists of four lots and approximately 50 acres. The building which will be built on Lot 1 consists of a single three and two story structure with one out building. The development is age restricted. A private sewage disposal system and public water supply will be located on an adjacent parcel. System components include a 12,000 septic tank, and I/A system for nitrogen reduction, pump chamber and leaching field. Septic capacity is estimated at 3900 GPD using the elderly design flow of 150 GPD per unit. The leaching field will be located on Lot 4 which has been tested. Lot 4 is under a Conservation Restriction. Sewage Disposal is an allowed function. The public water supply will also be located on Lot 4. The siting of the well is intended to keep most of the IWPA on town owned land. Zone I will require a 189' setback. Zone II requires approximately 487'. A leaching area can be sited in the IWPA but not the Zone I. This is classified as a nitrogen sensitive area but has sufficient adjacent land to compensate. However, since the system will be greater than 2000 GPD, nitrogen reducing treatment is required. Only treated effluent will be sent to the leaching area. Currently they are considering a FAST or Bioclere type of system. No decision has been made. They are also considering a Presby design for the leaching area which will help to reduce the footprint from a conventional system. Title 5 does not require pressure dosing for systems greater than 2000 GPD if a Presby system is used. Vents will be concealed along the perimeters. The proposed site will result in a system that is only slightly above grade. No large mounds will be required. Last spring Meridian tested and alternative location on Lot 1 closer to the building. Test results and mounding analysis were very poor due to percolation rates and high groundwater. Lot 4 is a much better location for the system based on soil testing. Based on the testing results it should be possible to keep the system along the existing grade slope and in the ground.

The Board then discussed the input received from the Town Advisory Group (TAG) whose role is to provide preliminary technical advice. Brem chairs the Group. Since the land is under conservation restriction there are two main issues: a requirement that the system meet existing grade as much as possible; avoid the vernal pool area as much as possible. The current design locates the system 135' from BVW and 160' from the vernal pool. The proposed design will require two different alternative treatments – a Presby and nitrogen reducing one. The Board noted that there will be ongoing monitoring and maintenance requirements. Whatever system is chosen, the Board will need details and calculations in order to review. Beaudry identified a possible location for the mechanical components. Since these systems are motorized and involve blowers, noise and odors must be addressed. The Board suggested keeping the blower as far from dwelling windows as possible. The Board has dealt with a number of FAST systems. Beaudry said they are just now considering various systems, including FAST. As for the location of the leaching area which will be a distance from the structure, the Board will want a detailed narrative explaining why one location was chosen over others. Information must be provided on test data, treatment, and environmental impacts. The TAG had begun looking into alternative locations for wells and the leaching area given the various constraints on the property. At this time the Recreation Dept. has no specific plans for developing playing fields on Lots 2 or 3 but it is still a future possibility. The Conservation Commission also expressed a few ideas about Lot 4. (Phil Giffie arrived). Discussion ensued about moving the leaching area farther to the north and locating the public water supply in the buffer zone. This might cause the Zone II to impact adjacent properties, although the area consists mainly of wetlands. Brem suggested that the developer consider future uses of the back property when constructing the access road. Giffie said the road would normally handle the two utility lines. If it were to serve a playing field in the back of the property, the road would have to be constructed differently. Brem said these are the kinds of issues that the town should be thinking about. He also pointed out a gate that prevented access to the soft parking area. There are other design structures such as boulders or posts which would allow pedestrian but not vehicle access. He also suggested providing information on the function of the bio-retention basin as a public education feature. It was agreed that the landscape architect would best deal with these issues.

Beaudry then asked what the Board was thinking relative to design flows. Currently they are planning 26 units at 150 GPD per unit which is Title 5 flows for senior housing. The development actually consists of 18 one bedroom and 8 two bedroom units for a total of 34 bedrooms. At 100GPD, which is the flow rate for a single family home, the gallons per day equal 3740 compared to the 3900 for senior housing. Local regulations require 165 per bedroom for condominiums or systems greater than 200 GPSD equaling 5610 GPD for the project. This is due to the additional laundry, dishwashers that might be in place. Giffie said the development is a Green Project, looking to be as energy efficient as possible. The Board agreed that it would prefer to meet the middle ground in the design flows which is using the 150 GPD per unit elderly housing flows. Another area of concern, particular for senior housing, is disposal of pharmaceuticals. The Board agreed that public education is a good way to address this. The

Board also suggested moving the distribution box uphill to the SAS and consider an equalizer tank to eliminate the surge. Beaudry will check whether the Presby system allows this type of distribution. Beaudry said they will show access and cleanouts on the final plan. Brem suggested including a profile of the force main under the road. It may need to be deeper depending on whether Recreation is thinking of using the access road to deliver traffic to ball fields. Alan Lehotsky wanted to know who would be responsible for maintaining the road. It will never be an accepted street. The Board did not have an answer.

As for the water supply, the sprinkler system will use a separate well. The Board said this will still require a Board of Health permit, as well as any irrigation well. The Board will want to make sure there are no impacts to adjacent properties from the water use in the development. The developer should provide calculations on water usage. The drinking water supply is a public well. If it takes more than one well, they will be considered a well field.

Brem asked for additional Board comments. Risso said he is still concerned about the proximity of the mechanical blower to the buildings. It is only about 30' from the building.

**VOLUNTEER APPRECIATION** – due to the length of time involved on the Benfield presentation, the Board did not get to recognize its MRC Volunteers. The Board will take an opportunity to do this at a later date.

**173 ROCKLAND ROAD** – present for the discussion were Mr. and Mrs. Stropkay, owners.

Mr. Stropkay explained that they were upgrading the system as part of adding on to the house. Initial testing has been done. The well will be relocated. The leaching field will be 83' from BVW. They would like to add a fourth bedroom but this may not be possible. The addition is for a garage and family room. According to Stamski & McNary, the proposed location is the best for the site. Testing in the front had ledge; closer to the house would prevent adding on. Given the constraints of the property, the Board did not recommend enlarging the system to four bedrooms. This would result in a mounded system and a barrier. The amount of fill required would be expensive. There are no plans for the existing system which their engineer does not believe will pass a Title 5 Inspection. Brem asked if it might be possible to get an easement from an adjacent property to provide some relief. The Stropkays were uncertain about this. The Board suggested staying with a three bedroom design rather than trying to enlarge to a four bedroom which requires new construction compliance. One of the existing bedrooms might be converted into a hallway. The Stropkays thanked the Board for their input and agreed to investigate the other alternatives before filing

**FY11 BUDGET** – Fincom has asked each department to explain the effects of a 10% reduction for a meeting on 11/6/09. The Board is concerned that there has been a no growth budget for the last three years. This severely impacts the operating budget. On the positive side, the Board has access to \$20000 from the septic loan program with which it can use to pay administrative costs of the agent or assistant. The Board agreed it should be able to meet guidelines due to this additional funding source.

There was no further business discussed. Meeting voted to adjourn at 10:30 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Linda Fantasia, Recorder